

Page 4 Taylor  
X Plus 2 Mr. D.  
TAYLOR

provisions committee marked up this bill, a change in the defense organization had not been announced by the White House. Had this change been announced at the time the defense appropriation subcommittee marked up this bill I certainly would have called it to the attention of this committee. I do feel it is important for us to realize what has taken place in the appointment of General Taylor as Military Adviser to the President of the United States.

This appointment is in direct conflict with the Unification Act which was passed by the Congress several years ago. The Unification Act provides that the military advisers to the President of the United States will be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the members of Joint Chiefs of Staff. By superimposing a military adviser in the White House over and above the authority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we have created a problem which I think will haunt the United States and its military preparedness program. We have divided responsibility contrary to the Unification Act which was passed by the Congress. We have an attempt here to set up a single chief system bypassing the authority of the Congress. We have divided military responsibility at a very important time in the history of this country. At this time we are facing a very important crisis in Berlin which should not be faced with split responsibility.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I feel very strongly that it is unfortunate the President has established among his group of White House advisers a separate military adviser to him. I think it is bad from an organization point of view to have a separate individual military adviser in the White House acting, possibly, contrary to the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense and the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is just a bad organizational setup it can and undoubtedly will lead to difficulty because of the obvious pitfalls.

Secondly, I fear that this might lead to an undercutting of the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This is no reflection on General Taylor. He is a man of great military experience and unquestioned honor, but he has strong views, as the gentleman from Wisconsin knows about certain military programs. If I recall correctly from previous testimony given to the Defense subcommittee, his views on certain military programs and policies are completely contrary to the recommendations of the present Secretary of Defense and the present Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. LAIRD. And the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff...

Mr. FORD. Have you have an atmosphere of unfortunate conflict, conflict which will unify our military policy or in the future badly need

a mistake for the President to establish this office in the White House at this time.

Mr. LAIRD. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to ask my friend from Wisconsin if he would not agree that the appointment of General Taylor was not in contravention of any existing provision of law.

Mr. LAIRD. I merely refer to the Unification Act. I would like to state to the gentleman from Texas that that act clearly states that the military advisers to the President will be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chiefs of Staff.

It seems to me that by setting up another echelon of military advice we are clearly bypassing the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I believe this is dangerous.

The President of the United States has the authority to appoint the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Chiefs of each of the individual services, and it seems to me the responsibility instead of being pinpointed as the law intended, is being dispersed. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that there are certain views of General Taylor which decidedly are not the views of the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who has been giving them to us in testimony before our committee. It seems to me that responsibility at a time such as this needs to be pinpointed and should not be spread out throughout the Government.

Mr. MAHON. I have no quarrel with the law nor with the responsibility which it fixes upon the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense, but I understand General Taylor has been appointed merely as a personal adviser and assistant to the President.

Mr. LAIRD. Let us say as an assistant advising the President on military matters.

Mr. MAHON. But he is not in line of command, he does not have power to act, as do the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. LAIRD. It seems to me it shows complete lack of confidence in the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is the military adviser to the President under the law passed by the Congress of the United States, and we have not been asked to change that law.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to point out that the President needs all the advisers he can get. He gets advice from many quarters, including members of his own Cabinet. I do not see anything wrong with getting advice from helpful sources, and certainly General Taylor is a man of real stature and ability. This should not be interpreted in any way as a repudiation of the Joint Chiefs or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs; it is merely an attempt as I see it, of the President to get somebody to be at his side from time to time to assist him in problems which arise.